

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
SMART ILESANMI AJAYI, <i>Individually</i>	)	
<i>and d/b/a</i> HARPLET MARKETING, LLC,	)	
TOPPS TAX SERVICES, and SMART TAX	)	
SERVICES, and JOANN VILLARREAL,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	Civil Action No. 3:19-CV-0476-C-BH

**ORDER**

Before the Court are the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge therein advising the Court that Plaintiff's *motion for order for Defendant to show cause why he should not be in civil contempt for violating the Court's injunction order* [Doc. 26] and Plaintiff's *motion for order for Defendant to show cause why he should not be in civil contempt for violating the Court's injunction orders* [Doc. 42] should be denied.<sup>1</sup>

The Court conducts a *de novo* review of those portions of the Magistrate Judge's report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which a timely objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Portions of the report or proposed findings or recommendations that are not the subject of a timely objection will be accepted by the Court unless they are clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989).


---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff has filed timely objections to the United States Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation.

After due consideration and having conducted a *de novo* review, the Court finds that Plaintiff's objections should be **OVERRULED**. The Court has further conducted an independent review of the Magistrate Judge's findings and conclusions and finds no error. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation are hereby **ADOPTED** as the findings and conclusions of the Court. For the reasons stated therein, the Court **ORDERS** that Plaintiff's *motion for order for Defendant to show cause why he should not be in civil contempt for violating the Court's injunction order* [Doc. 26] and Plaintiff's *motion for order for Defendant to show cause why he should not be in civil contempt for violating the Court's injunction orders* [Doc. 42] be **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated October 20, 2021.



---

SAM R. CUMMINGS  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE